UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,216 09/01/2005		Ping Wang	089498-0436	7310
39905 ROETZEL ANI	7590 11/04/200 D ANDRESS	EXAMINER		
222 SOUTH M	AIN STREET	KAM, CHIH MIN		
AKRON, OH 4	4306		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1656	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/04/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/519,216	WANG ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
CHIH-MIN KAM	1656	

	CHIH-MIN KAM	1656	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 03 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>6</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Aino event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	031160
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belown)(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in beti	•	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
appeal; and/or		antant alabasa	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		(-	, .
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	timely filed amendmer	t canceling the
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov 		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 4,5,10,12,14 and 16-19.			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>3</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,6-9,11,13 and 15</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Chih-Min Kam/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1656	

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejection of claims 3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tennent et al. (U.S. Patent 6,099,960).

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's reply does not overcome the rejection of claims 1, 8, 9, 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tennent et al. (U.S. Patent 6,099,960); and the rejection of claims 1, 6-9, 11, 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Iyer et al. (Abstract of Papers, 221st ACS national meeting, San Diago, CA, United States, April 1-5, 2001 ANYL-035). See paragraphs 7 and 8 of Office Action dated 6/3/08).

Regarding the rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 9, 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tennent et al., applicants indicate claim 5 should not be rejected since claim 5 depends from claim 4, which is not rejected. Tennent et al. discloses a nanofiber comprising carbon and the nanofiber is functionalized so that it may immobilize active groups such as enzymes, antibodies or antigens. However, the functionalization of the carbon nanofibers of Tennent et al. occurs only on the surface thereof. On the other hand, claims 1 and 11 recite the at least one functional group to which a protein is attached is contained within a portion of the fiber-forming material. The persons of ordinary skill in the art would understand the words "on" and "contained within" have marked different meanings. Thus, Tennent et al. fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, and the rejection should be withdrawn (pages 7-8 of the response).

Applicants' response has been fully considered, regarding claim 5, the argument is persuasive, thus the rejection of claim 5 is withdrawn. However, regarding claims 1, 8, 9, 11 and 13, the arguments are not persuasive because of the following reasons. While claims 1 and 11 recite the at least one functional group to which a protein is attached is contained within a portion of the fiber-forming material, the claims do not define "the portion", thus, the portion can be the portion on the surface of the fiber-forming material. Thus, the at least one functional group that is contained within a portion of the fiber-forming material can be on the surface of the carbon nanofibers as taught by Tennent et al. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1, 8, 9, 11 and 13 is maintained.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1, 6-9, 11, 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Iyer et al., applicants indicate Iyer et al. discloses immobilization of enzymes onto surface supports that are formed on the surface of a cellulose nanofibers with carbon immobilization matrices. On the other hand, claims 1 and 11 recite the at least one functional group to which a protein is attached is contained within a portion of the fiber-forming material. The persons of ordinary skill in the art would understand the words "on" and "contained within" have marked different meanings. Thus, Iyer et al. fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, and the rejection should be withdrawn (pages 8-9 of the response).

Applicants' response has been fully considered. However, the arguments are not persuasive because of the following reasons. While claims 1 and 11 recite the at least one functional group to which a protein is attached is contained within a portion of the fiber-forming material, the claims do not define "the portion", thus, the portion can be the portion on the surface of the fiber-forming material. Thus, the at least one functional group that is contained within a portion of the fiber-forming material can be on the surface of the cellulose nanofibers as taught by lyer et al. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1, 6-9, 11, 13 and 15 is maintained.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chih-Min Kam whose telephone number is (571) 272-0948. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.00-4:30, Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathleen Bragdon can be reached at 571-272-0931. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chih-Min Kam, Ph. D. Primary Patent Examiner

CMK October 28, 2008